



UNICEF Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) Review Template

Colour Coding	CC	Dark green	Green	Amber	Red	White
	Questions	Outstanding	Yes	Almost	No	Not Applicable
	Section & Overall Rating	Very Confident to Act	Confident to Act	Almost Confident to Act	Not Confident to Act	

The key questions are highlighted as shown here, and are important questions in guiding the analysis of the section

The Cornerstone questions are in column J and are questions that need to be answered for rating and justification of each of the six sections

[UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System](#)

[UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System](#)

[UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards](#)

		Response				
Title of the Evaluation Report		Repeat Evaluation of Youth Friendly Clinics in Ukraine				
Report sequence number		2011-002	Date of Review	23/4/2012	Year of the Evaluation Report	2011
Region		Central & Eastern Europe, Commonwealth of Independent States RO			Country(ies)	Ukraine
Type of Report		Evaluation			TORs Present	Yes
Name of reviewer		IOD PARC				
Classification of Evaluation Report					Comments	
Geographical <i>(Coverage of the programme being evaluated & generalizability of evaluation findings)</i>		1.2 National: The programme covers the whole country, and the evaluation draws a sample in every district, or uses a sampling frame that is representative of the whole country.				
Management <i>(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)</i>		2.5 Not clear from Report				
Purpose <i>(Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être)</i>		3.7 Programme: An evaluation of a sectorial programme to determine its overall effectiveness and efficiency in relation to the stated goals and objectives				The purpose is formulated in the ToR as "research evaluation focused on client views and perceptions and provide a comparative analysis with similar research conducted in 2008".
Result <i>(Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached)</i>		4.2 Outcome: Effects from one or more programmes being implemented by multiple actors (UNICEF and others), where the cumulative effect of outputs elicits results beyond the control of any one agency or programme				It should be noted that the evaluation criteria relevant to the level of Results, "effectiveness" and "performance" are not specified in the evaluation report. moreover, efficiency is excluded from the report, although specifically mentioned as one of the evaluation criteria in the ToR.
MTSP Correspondence <i>(Alignment with MTSP focus area priorities: (1) Young child survival and development; (2) Basic education and gender equality; (3) HIV/AIDS and children; (4) Child protection from violence, exploitation and abuse; and (5) Policy advocacy and partnerships for children's rights)</i>		5.2 Multi-sectoral: Addresses issues in two or more MTSP focus areas				
Level of Independence <i>(Implementation and control of the evaluation activities)</i>		6.4 Not clear from Report				The evaluation was carried out by a local research team and an independent consultant. The report and ToR do not clarify the status of the local research team's independence.
Timing / Stage		7.2 Summative: An evaluation that examines the effects or outcomes of the object being evaluated and summarize it by describing what happened subsequent to delivery of the programme				

Question	cc	Remarks		
Object and context			<p>A/ Does the report present a clear & full description of the 'object' of the evaluation? The report should describe the object of the evaluation including the results chain, meaning the 'theory of change' that underlies the programme being evaluated. This theory of change includes what the programme was meant to achieve and the pathway (chain of results) through which it was expected to achieve this. The context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors that have a direct bearing on the object should be described. For example, the partner government's strategies and priorities, international, regional or country development goals, strategies and frameworks, the concerned agency's corporate goals & priorities, as appropriate.</p>	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>1 Is the object of the evaluation well described? This needs to include a clear description of the interventions (project, programme, policies, otherwise) to be evaluated including how the designer thought that it would address the problem identified, implementing modalities, other parameters including costs, relative importance in the organization and (number of) people reached.</p>	Almost	<p>The object of the evaluation - the Youth Friendly Clinic Programme - is well described, as are the legal and institutional background and context, and the health hazards confronting youth in Ukraine. However, relevant information about the 2008 evaluation (findings, conclusions, recommendations) is not included, nor is there a comparative analysis of the progress made since then. The context analysis contains lengthy, detailed sector-specific descriptions, covering policies, strategies, frameworks and priorities at the national - mainly government - level, but little to no broader data (social, political, economic, demographic, institutional). The context provided does illuminate findings, but because the information is too extensive and detailed, it becomes difficult to distinguish between major and minor issues.</p>		
<p>2 Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated? The context includes factors that have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation: social, political, economic, demographic, institutional. These factors may include strategies, policies, goals, frameworks & priorities at the: international level; national Government level; individual agency level</p>	Almost			
<p>3 Does this illuminate findings? The context should ideally be linked to the findings so that it is clear how the wider situation may have influenced the outcomes observed.</p>	Almost			
Theory of Change			<p>Not Confident to Act</p>	<p>An evaluation process begins with clear descriptions of the object of the evaluation, its purpose, objectives and scope in the Terms of Reference, in compliance with generally accepted standards. It is also important to describe the context in which the evaluation object is situated, and the major players/stakeholders involved, as these are likely to influence progress achieved during implementation.</p>
<p>4 Is the results chain or logic well articulated? The report should identify how the designers of the evaluated object thought that it would address the problem that they had identified. This can include a results chain or other logic models such as theory of change. It can include inputs, outputs and outcomes, it may also include impacts. The models need to be clearly described and explained.</p>	No	<p>A results chain is not included in the report, nor are the key elements of the 2008 evaluation, which constitute the benchmarks for this repeat evaluation. As a result, it is not clear what the YFC programme was expected to achieve, why, how, when, at what cost, nor at which level.</p>		
Stakeholders and their contributions				
<p>5 Are key stakeholders clearly identified? These include o implementing agency(ies) o development partners o rights holders o primary duty bearers o secondary duty bearers</p>	Almost	<p>Implementing agencies, and to a lesser extent rights holders, are well described. Development partners and duty bearers are mainly described in general terms. Contributions of key national stakeholders are well described, although specific financial data is missing. UNICEF's contributions are only very vaguely described; its financial and other contributions are <u>not</u> specified.</p>		
<p>6 Are key stakeholders' contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific. If joint program also specify UNICEF contribution, but if basket funding question is not applicable</p>	Almost			
<p>7 Are UNICEF contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific</p>	No			
Implementation Status				
<p>8 Is the implementation status described? This includes the phase of implementation and significant changes that have happened to plans, strategies, performance frameworks, etc that have occurred - including the implications of these changes</p>	Almost	<p>Although the report includes a lengthy description of the history of YFCs in Ukraine and the evolution it has made since its inception in 1995, one of the main components of the evaluation - a present a comparative analysis of the obtained data with the result of the 2008 study - is missing. This would presumably have shown the (significant) changes to the programme and their implications.</p>		
<p>Executive Feedback on Section A Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>Although the object of the evaluation - the Youth Friendly Clinic Programme - is well described, including detailed descriptions of the legal and institutional background and health hazards confronting youth in Ukraine, key information - about the 2008 evaluation (findings, conclusions, recommendations), a results chain, and UNICEF contributions - are not included, nor is there a comparative analysis of the progress made since the similar evaluation in 2008. The latter was identified as a main component of the ToR.</p>			

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE			
Question	cc	Remarks	
Purpose, objectives and scope			
9 Is the purpose of the evaluation clear? This includes why the evaluation is needed at this time, who needs the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.	No	Terminology on purpose, goals and objectives is not clearly presented. The purpose described in the ToR is termed the goal in the evaluation; in reality they describe the objectives of the evaluation. It is not clear why the evaluation is needed at this time (beyond the comment that a repeat evaluation was already foreseen in 2008), who needs the information and how the information will be used. The objectives are framed in terms of evaluation criteria. Beyond these criteria, it is not clear what the scope of the evaluation entails (e.g. which period, what is or is not covered). In the absence of a clear purpose, objectives and scope do not relate to one.	B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation? The purpose of the evaluation should be clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, and how the information will be used. The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover. The report should describe and provide an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators.
10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic? This includes: Objectives should be clear and explain what the evaluation is seeking to achieve; Scope should clearly describe and justify what the evaluation will and will not cover; Evaluation questions may optionally be included to add additional details	Almost		
11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose? The reasons for holding the evaluation at this time in the project cycle (purpose) should link logically with the specific objectives the evaluation seeks to achieve and the boundaries chosen for the evaluation (scope)	No		
Evaluation framework			
12 Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose? It is imperative to make the basis of the value judgements used in the evaluation transparent if it is to be understood and convincing. UNEG evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria, but other criteria can be used such as Human rights and humanitarian criteria and standards (e.g. SPHERE Standards) but this needs justification. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. The TOR may set the criteria to be used, but these should be (re)confirmed by the evaluator. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact Additional humanitarian criteria include; Coverage; Coordination; Coherence; Protection <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i>	Almost	Not Confident to Act	Clarity on purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation, as well as evaluation criteria applied, is inadequate. It is not clear from the report why the evaluation is needed at this time, who needs the information and how the information will be used. The objectives are framed in terms of evaluation criteria. Beyond these criteria, it is not clear what the scope of the evaluation entails Although the evaluation provides a relevant list of evaluation criteria, plus, for some of these, a definition, it does not refer to the DAC/OECD criteria, nor does it explain why these were not all chosen, and others (accessibility, acceptability, compliance, topicality) were.
13 Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected? The rationale for using each particular criterion and rejecting any standard OECD-DAC criteria (where they would be applicable) should be explained in the report.	No		
Executive Feedback on Section B Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	Clarity on purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation, as well as evaluation criteria applied, is inadequate. It is not clear from the report why the evaluation is needed at this time, who needs the information and how the information will be used. The objectives are framed in terms of evaluation criteria. Beyond these criteria, it is not clear what the scope of the evaluation entails. Although the evaluation provides a relevant list of evaluation criteria, plus, for some of these, a definition, it does not refer to the DAC/OECD criteria, nor does it explain why these were not all chosen, and others (accessibility, acceptability, compliance, topicality) were. The evaluation does not contain an evaluation matrix.		
		Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>	

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Data collection				
<p>14 Does the report specify data collection methods, analysis methods, sampling methods and benchmarks? This should include the rationale for selecting methods and their limitations based on commonly accepted best practice.</p>	Yes	The report specifies data collection, analysis and sampling methods adequately. It also specifies data sources and the rationale for their selection, but does not include an assessment of their limitations.	<p>C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?</p> <p>The report should present a transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve the evaluation purposes.</p> <p>The report should also present a sufficiently detailed description of methodology in which methodological choices are made explicit and justified and in which limitations of methodology applied are included. The report should give the elements to assess the appropriateness of the methodology. Methods as such are not 'good' or 'bad', they are only so in relation to what one tries to get to know as part of an evaluation. Thus this standard assesses the suitability of the methods selected for the specifics of the evaluation concerned, assessing if the methodology is suitable to the subject matter and the information collected are sufficient to meet the evaluation objectives.</p>	
<p>15 Does the report specify data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations? This should include a discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure accuracy & overcome data limits</p>	Almost			
Ethics				
<p>16 Are ethical issues and considerations described? The design of the evaluation should contemplate: How ethical the initial design of the programme was; The balance of costs and benefits to participants (including possible negative impact) in the programme and in the evaluation; The ethics of who is included and excluded in the evaluation and how this is done</p>	Yes	Ethical issues, considerations and safeguards are addressed throughout various sections of the report, in particular methodology and findings.		
<p>17 Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the issues described? When the topic of an evaluation is contentious, there is a heightened need to protect those participating. These should be guided by the UNICEF Evaluation Office Technical Note and include: protection of confidentiality; protection of rights; protection of dignity and welfare of people (especially children); Informed consent; Feedback to participants; Mechanisms for shaping the behaviour of evaluators and data collectors</p>	Yes			
Results Based Management				
<p>18 Is the capability and robustness of the evaluated object's monitoring system adequately assessed? The evaluation should consider the details and overall functioning of the management system in relation to results: from the M&E system design, through individual tools, to the use of data in management decision making.</p>	No	The evaluation does assess management systems, but mainly from the executive and coordination angles. In the absence of a results chain, it remains unclear how issues of RBM were to be managed in the programme. The evaluation team makes no attempt to "reconstruct" a results chain from the available information, nor does it assess the programme's internal monitoring system.	<p>Not Confident to Act</p> <p>The report specifies data collection, analysis and sampling methods adequately. Ethical issues, considerations and safeguards are addressed throughout various sections of the report, in particular methodology and findings. However, in the absence of a results chain, it remains unclear how issues of RBM were to be managed in the programme. The evaluation team makes no attempt to "reconstruct" a results chain from the available information, nor does it assess the programme's internal monitoring system. The focus of the evaluation is on young people's social, emotional and physical health. The report elaborates extensively on the standards applied by WHO and the Ukrainian government itself in that regard. The evaluation's analytical framework, findings and conclusions do - to some extent - provide appropriate information on adolescents rights, some of which are disaggregated by gender. Women's empowerment, however, is not addressed, though Equity considerations are. Levels and activities of stakeholder consultation, beyond their role as provider of information, are not described. While some evaluation questions and criteria are addressed, others are not</p>	
<p>19 Does the evaluation make appropriate use of the M&E framework of the evaluated object? In addition to articulating the logic model (results chain) used by the programme, the evaluation should make use of the object's logframe or other results framework to guide the assessment. The results framework indicates how the programme design team expected to assess effectiveness, and it forms the guiding structure for the management of implementation.</p>	No			
Human Rights, Gender and Equity				
<p>20 Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity? This could be done in a variety of ways including: use of a rights-based framework, use of CRC, CCC, CEDAW and other rights related benchmarks, analysis of right holders and duty bearers and focus on aspects of equity, social exclusion and gender. Style includes: using human-rights language; gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing; disaggregating data by gender, age and disability groups; disaggregating data by socially excluded groups</p>	Almost	The focus of the evaluation is on young people's social, emotional and physical health. The report elaborates extensively on the standards applied by WHO and the Ukrainian government itself in that regard. While the UN's human rights-based approach is not explicitly taken as a starting point, the performance of the programme vis-a-vis the rights of adolescents to decent health standards is the driving force behind the evaluation. The evaluation assesses performance of YFC's against a set of specific		

Constructive feedback for future reports
Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice

Another important component involves the assessment of the quality of the object's internal data management systems, especially if data used in the evaluation is derived from programme documents. The reader must know how credible this information is before passing judgement.

<p>21 Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the evaluated object was monitored through human rights (inc. gender, equity & child rights) frameworks? UNICEF commits to go beyond monitoring the achievement of desirable outcomes, and to ensure that these are achieved through morally acceptable processes. The evaluation should consider whether the programme was managed and adjusted according to human rights and gender monitoring of processes.</p>	Almost	standards, but does not assess the HR-based approach focus of the programme's own monitoring system (see comments on RBM). The evaluation's analytical framework, findings and conclusions do - to some extent - provide appropriate information on adolescents rights, some of which are disaggregated by gender. Women's empowerment, however, is not addressed, though Equity considerations are.	answered adequately, or addressed at all. The comparative analysis, seen as a critical goal/objective of the evaluation, is missing altogether.
<p>22 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on HUMAN RIGHTS (inc. women & child rights)? The inclusion of human rights frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the level of: Identification of the human rights claims of rights-holders and the corresponding human rights obligations of duty-bearers, as well as the immediate underlying & structural causes of the non realisation of rights.; Capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations.</p>	Almost		
<p>23 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT? The inclusion of gender equality frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the immediate underlying & structural causes of social exclusion; and capacity development of women to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil their equality obligations.</p>	Almost		
<p>24 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on EQUITY? The inclusion of equity considerations in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations & aspects of equity.</p>	Yes		
Stakeholder participation			
<p>25 Are the levels and activities of stakeholder consultation described? This goes beyond just using stakeholders as sources of information and includes the degree of participation in the evaluation itself. The report should include the rationale for selecting this level of participation. Roles for participation might include: o Liaison o Technical advisory o Observer o Active decision making The reviewer should look for the soundness of the description and rationale for the degree of participation rather than the level of participation itself.</p>	No	Levels and activities of stakeholder consultation, beyond their role as provider of information, are not described. Although the evaluation team uses a variety of data collection methods for different groups of people, stakeholders' participation does not involve other roles.	
<p>26 Are the levels of participation appropriate for the task in hand? The breadth & degree of stakeholder participation feasible in evaluation activities will depend partly on the kind of participation achieved in the evaluated object. The reviewer should note here whether a higher degree of participation may have been feasible & preferable.</p>	N/A		

Methodological robustness			
<p>27 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual? The counterfactual can be constructed in several ways which can be more or less rigorous. It can be done by contacting eligible beneficiaries that were not reached by the programme, or a theoretical counterfactual based on historical trends, or it can also be a comparison group.</p>	Almost	A survey was conducted among a group of youth that had not visited a YFC. This "counterfactual" was mainly related to issue of coverage and does not provide further information with regard to the performance of YFCs in other areas. In principle, the methodology as such should be capable of answering the evaluation questions; in practice, it does so only to a limited extent. As mentioned before, the report fails to provide a comparative analysis. Some evaluation questions and criteria are addressed,	
<p>28 Can the methodology answer the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation? The methodology should link back to the Purpose and be capable of providing answers to the evaluation questions.</p>	No	Others are not answered adequately, or answered at all. Methodological limitations are not identified as such.	
<p>29 Are methodological limitations acceptable for the task in hand? Limitations must be specifically recognised and appropriate efforts taken to control bias. This includes the use of triangulation, and the use of robust data collection tools (interview protocols, observation tools etc). Bias limitations can be addressed in three main areas: Bias inherent in the sources of data; Bias introduced through the methods of data collection; Bias that colours the interpretation of findings</p>	No		
<p>Executive Feedback on Section C Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>The report specifies data collection, analysis and sampling methods adequately. Ethical issues, considerations and safeguards are addressed throughout various sections of the report, in particular methodology and findings. However, in the absence of a results chain, it remains unclear how issues of RBM were to be managed in the programme. The evaluation team makes no attempt to "reconstruct" a results chain from the available information, nor does it assess the programme's internal monitoring system. The focus of the evaluation is on young people's social, emotional and physical health. The report elaborates extensively on the standards applied by WHO and the Ukrainian government itself in that regard. The evaluation's analytical framework, findings and conclusions do - to some extent - provide appropriate information on adolescents rights, some of which are disaggregated by gender. Women's empowerment, however, is not addressed, though Equity considerations are. Levels and activities of stakeholder consultation, beyond their role as provider of information, are not described. While some evaluation questions and criteria are addressed, others are not answered adequately, or answered at all. The comparative analysis, seen as a critical goal/objective of the evaluation, is missing altogether.</p>		

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Completeness and logic of findings				
<p>30 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence? Findings regarding the inputs for the completion of activities or process achievements should be distinguished clearly from results. Findings on results should clearly distinguish outputs, outcomes and impacts (where appropriate). Findings must demonstrate full marshalling and objective use of the evidence generated by the evaluation data collection. Findings should also tell the 'whole story' of the evidence and avoid bias.</p>	No	The findings in the report consist mainly of answers to some of the questions raised in the ToR. They contain information on indicators of predetermined principles of service provision, features of administration and organisation of YFC's work, and the results of perception surveys among YFC clients about YFC's services. Some findings are "hidden" in the context-description (Ch. 2). A very significant omission in the report is the <u>lack of a comparative analysis</u> of the performance since 2008 with the period before. The findings do not distinguish between outputs, outcomes and impact, and in some cases, they are not grounded in sound evidence. They address some evaluation criteria, such as	<p>D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence & sound analysis? Findings should respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report. They should be based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report. Conclusions should present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, providing insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>31 Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions? The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report.</p>	No	accessibility, but not all of the evaluation's stated criteria. Moreover, there is no logical explanation provided as to why 5 so-called YFC standards (equality, accessibility, appropriateness, adequacy and effectiveness) are chosen to cover the three evaluation criteria accessibility, acceptability and relevance, nor why friendliness and voluntariness are included in a subsequent list of definitions (Chapter 3, page 43-44). As a result of this conceptual confusion, it is unclear how the findings themselves relate to the evaluation criteria. Four of the DAC/OECD evaluation criteria (relevancy, effectiveness, performance and sustainability) are not supported by evidence and receive very little attention in the report. In the absence of a results chain, findings do not demonstrate progression to results. Limitations in data availability are not discussed, nor are caveats provided. There are no unexpected findings reported.		
<p>32 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported? There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.</p>	No			
<p>33 Are gaps and limitations discussed? The data may be inadequate to answer all the evaluation questions as satisfactorily as intended, in this case the limitations should be clearly presented and discussed. Caveats should be included to guide the reader on how to interpret the findings. Any gaps in the programme or unintended effects should also be addressed.</p>	No			
<p>34 Are unexpected findings discussed? If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.</p>	N/A			
Cost Analysis				
<p>35 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported? Cost analysis is not always feasible or appropriate. If this is the case then the reasons should be explained. Otherwise the evaluation should use an appropriate scope and methodology of cost analysis to answer the following questions: o How programme costs compare to other similar programmes or standards o Most efficient way to get expected results o Cost implications of scaling up or down o Cost implications for replicating in a different context o Is the programme worth doing from a cost perspective o Costs and the sustainability of the programme.</p>	No	There is no cost analysis in the report, nor is there any information on funding, programme costs, revenues (if any), cost implications and cost sustainability etc.	<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Not Confident to Act</p>	<p>It is absolutely vital that the findings presented are relevant, complete and trustworthy. They form the evidence base for the analysis, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. They must speak to the original plans, display the degree of causality, and be credible. A cost analysis is an integral part of the assessment and should not be overlooked. Conclusions must follow logically from the findings, displaying evaluative insights and describing the "so what" question.</p>

Contribution and causality		
<p>36 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders? For results attributed to the programme, the result should be mapped as accurately as possible to the inputs of different stakeholders.</p>	Almost	The evaluation attempts to describe certain achievements of the YFCs in areas such as client satisfaction, equity, accessibility, coverage and the like. The contribution of OKHMATDYT is also addressed in the report. It is not clear to what extent the "conclusions" do or do not take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders.
<p>37 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders? As well as being logically derived from findings, conclusions should seek to represent the range of views encountered in the evaluation, and not simply reflect the bias of the individual evaluator. Carrying these diverse views through to the presentation of conclusions (considered here) is only possible if the methodology has gathered and analysed information from a broad range of stakeholders.</p>	N/A	Lacking a results chain as well as a comparative analysis of progress achieved before and after 2008 on key issues, it is not possible to establish robust causal relations between actions and results.
<p>38 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible? These should be concise and usable. They should be based on the evidence and be theoretically robust. <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i></p>	No	
Strengths, weaknesses and implications		
<p>39 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed? The implications can be, for example, in terms of the cost of the programme, ability to deliver results, reputational risk, and breach of human rights obligations.</p>	Almost	Certain constraints are raised in the final sections of the report. These mainly involve issues of management, coordination, collaboration, quality, and coverage. Some were already reported in earlier sections of the evaluation report, others less so (e.g. coverage of MARA/YP). Conclusions are not
<p>40 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object? Conclusions should give a balanced view of both the stronger aspects and weaker aspects of the evaluated object with reference to the evaluation criteria and human rights based approach.</p>	Almost	conclusions as such (see below), but do highlight some of the strengths and weaknesses of the YFCs as a whole. However, their evidence-base is often shallow, due in part to the absence of the comparative analysis.
Completeness and insight of conclusions		
<p>41 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings? Conclusions should go beyond findings and identify important underlying problems and/or priority issues. Simple conclusions that are already well known do not add value and should be avoided.</p>	Almost	The conclusions listed in chapter 5 are a mixture of additional findings, descriptions, statements and recommendations, although they do include some evaluative judgements or insights into the constraints and opportunities related to the provision of youth-friendly health care in Ukraine. It follows that they
<p>42 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation? Conclusions should speak to the evaluation participants, stakeholders and users. These may cover a wide range of groups and conclusions should thus be stated clearly and accessibly: adding value and understanding to the report (for example, some stakeholders may not understand the methodology or findings, but the conclusions should clarify what these findings mean to them in the context of the programme).</p>	Almost	are not well-structured and presented in a way that is pitched to end users' requirements. That said, this section does add value and understanding to the report, but this has more to do with the inadequacy of preceding sections, than with the quality of the conclusions themselves.
<p>Executive Feedback on Section D Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>The findings in the report are incomplete. The comparative analysis mentioned in the ToR and Methodology section, is missing. There is no cost analysis. Findings do not distinguish between outputs, outcomes and impact, and in some cases, are not grounded in sound evidence. There is conceptual confusion over evaluation criteria, questions, definitions and indicators. Findings address some evaluation criteria, such as accessibility, but not all of the evaluation's stated criteria, including four of the DAC/OECD evaluation criteria (relevancy, effectiveness, performance and sustainability). In the absence of a results chain, findings do not demonstrate progression to results. Limitations in data availability are not discussed, nor are caveats provided. As a result, it is not possible to establish robust causal relations between actions and results. Conclusions include some evaluative judgements or insights but they are not well-structured and presented.</p>	

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED			
Question	cc	Remarks	
Relevance and clarity of recommendations			
43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported? Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.	Almost	There are no less than 25 recommendations listed in the report. Some are well grounded in data provided in the report, especially those on policy, leadership and regulatory framework priorities, and coordination. Others, however, are not / less grounded in evidence and/or do not appear to address priority issues. These would include recommendations on funding costs and YFC services. The recommendations are relevant to the object, but since the purpose of the evaluation is not described, their relevance to the purpose cannot be assessed. Some recommendations are clearly stated and specific, others are more general and therefore less useful. The recommendations are not prioritised.	<p>E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable?</p> <p>Recommendations should be relevant and actionable to the object and purpose of the evaluation, be supported by evidence and conclusions, and be developed with involvement of relevant stakeholders. Recommendations should clearly identify the target group for each recommendation, be clearly stated with priorities for action, be actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow up.</p>
44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	Almost		
45 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised? If the recommendations are few in number (up to 5) then this can also be considered to be prioritised. Recommendations that are over-specific or represent a long list of items are not of as much value to managers. Where there is a long list of recommendations, the most important should be ordered in priority.	Almost		
Usefulness of recommendations			
46 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action? Recommendations should provide clear and relevant suggestions for action linked to the stakeholders who might put that recommendation into action. This ensures that the evaluators have a good understanding of the programme dynamics and that recommendations are realistic.	Yes	The recommendations identify the target group for action and set deadlines. Based on the information provided in the report, some recommendations appear realistic, others perhaps less so. The report does not describe the process by which the recommendations were formulated nor to what extent stakeholders were able to participate in this process.	<p>Not Confident to Act</p> <p>Some recommendations are well grounded in data provided in the report, especially those on policy, leadership and regulatory framework priorities, and coordination. Others, however, are not / less grounded in evidence and/or do not appear to address priority issues. They are stated fairly clearly and are directed at target groups. Although there are 25 recommendations, they are not prioritised. There are no lessons learned in the report.</p>
47 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation? This includes: o an understanding of the commissioning organisation o awareness of the implementation constraints o an understanding of the follow-up processes	Almost		
48 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations? The preparation of recommendations needs to suit the evaluation process. Participation by stakeholders in the development of recommendations is strongly encouraged to increase ownership and utility.	No		
Appropriate lessons learned			
49 Are lessons learned correctly identified? Lessons learned are contributions to general knowledge. They may refine or add to commonly accepted understanding, but should not be merely a repetition of common knowledge. Findings and conclusions specific to the evaluated object are not lessons learned.	No	No lessons learned have been included with this report. UNICEF/UNEG standards state that lessons learned are an essential part of any evaluation report.	
50 Are lessons learned generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have? Correctly identified lessons learned should include an analysis of how they can be applied to contexts and situations outside of the evaluated object.			
Executive Feedback on Section E Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>		Some recommendations are well grounded in data provided in the report, especially those on policy, leadership and regulatory framework priorities, and coordination. Others, however, are not / less grounded in evidence and/or do not appear to address priority issues. They are stated fairly clearly and are directed at target groups. Although there are 25 recommendations, they are not prioritised. There are no lessons learned in the report.	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports</p> <p><i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>

SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Style and presentation			F/ Overall, do all these elements come together in a well structured, logical, clear and complete report? The report should be logically structured with clarity and coherence (e.g. background and objectives are presented before findings, and findings are presented before conclusions and recommendations). It should read well and be focused.	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
51. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements? Basic elements include all of: Name of the evaluated object; Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report; Locations of the evaluated object; Names and/or organisations of evaluators; Name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation; Table of contents including tables, graphs, figures and annex; List of acronyms	No	The opening pages contain some, but not all information. The timeframe of the evaluation, the names and / or organisations of evaluators, or the name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation are missing. The table of contents does not include a list of tables, graphs and figures. The report is not logically structured. The level of detail in certain descriptive sections (Ch. 2) is high, without differentiating between major and minor issues. No footnotes or endnotes are used, nor are sources identified. A description of the purpose, object and scope is missing, the methodology is inconsistent and confusing, a list of abbreviations is presented after the Introduction (i.e. Executive Summary). Findings do not always speak to the evaluation criteria and are spread over various chapters (including a description of the context, Ch. 2). Conclusions are spread throughout the report and include new findings and recommendations, and lessons learned are missing. The annexes contain appropriate elements, but the really critical information - e.g. evaluation matrix, results chain, summary of 2008 report and others - is missing.		
52 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	No			
53 Do the annexes contain appropriate elements? Appropriate elements may include: ToRs; List of interviewees and site visits; List of documentary evidence; Details on methodology; Data collection instruments; Information about the evaluators; Copy of the evaluation matrix; Copy of the Results chain. Where they add value to the report	No			
54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?	No			
Executive Summary			Not Confident to Act	
55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report? If the answer is No, question 56 to 58 should be N/A	Yes	An introduction is included in the report which may be considered the report's "executive summary". It does not contain all necessary elements, however: an overview of the evaluation objectives, intended audience, methodology are missing. Rather than conclusions, this section presents a selection of observations. 5 (out of 25) recommendations are listed. The introduction cannot stand alone, nor should it inform decision making, for the reasons listed in all previous sections.		
56 Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements? Necessary elements include all of: Overview of the evaluated object; Evaluation objectives and intended audience; Evaluation methodology; Most important findings and conclusions; Main recommendations	No			
57 Can the executive summary stand alone? It should not require reference to the rest of the report documents and should not introduce new information or arguments	No			
58 Can the executive summary inform decision making? It should be short (ideally 2-3 pages), and increase the utility for decision makers by highlight key priorities.	Almost			
Executive Feedback on Section F Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	The style and presentation of the report is inadequate. The opening pages are incomplete and the structure illogical. Too much detail is given at times, rendering the report user-unfriendly. Findings do not always speak to the evaluation criteria and are spread over various chapters. Conclusions are spread throughout the report and include new findings and recommendations, and lessons learned are missing. The annexes contain appropriate elements, but the really critical information - e.g. evaluation matrix, results chain, summary of 2008 report and others - is missing. The Executive Summary does not contain all necessary elements, cannot stand alone and should not inform decision making.			

Additional Information			
Question	Remarks		
i/ Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference? If the report does not include a TOR then a recommendation should be given to ensure that all evaluations include the TOR in the future. Some evaluations may be flawed because the TORs are inappropriate, too little time etc. Or, they may succeed despite inadequate TORs. This should be noted under vii in the next section	Problems with the TOR may be noted under Overall Rating Question 3		
ii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of evaluation			
iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise			
OVERALL RATING			
Question	cc	Remarks	OVERALL RATING Informed by the answers above, apply the reasonable person test to answer the following question: Ω/ Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence? This question should be considered from the perspective of UNICEF strategic management.
i/ To what extent does each of the six sections of the evaluation provide sufficient credibility to give the reasonable person confidence to act? Taken on their own, could a reasonable person have confidence in each of the five core evaluation elements separately? It is particularly important to consider: o Is the report methodologically appropriate? o Is the evidence sufficient, robust and authoritative? o Do the analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations hold together?	No	With the exception of chapter 2, in essence a detailed description of the YFC history and institutional context, the sections do not provide sufficient credibility to give confidence to act. The report is methodologically weak, evidence is incomplete and shallow, and analysis, findings and conclusions do not hold together.	The report does not give confidence to act. The report is methodologically weak, evidence is incomplete and shallow, and analysis, findings and conclusions do not hold together. The report is poorly structured and the six sections do not hold together in a logically consistent way.
ii/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report? The report should hold together not just as individually appropriate elements, but as a consistent and logical 'whole'.	No	Because the report is also poorly structured, the six sections do not hold together in a logically consistent and coherent way.	
iii/ Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report? This is a chance to note mitigating factors and/or crucial issues apparent in the review of the report.	ToRs	The ToR is not very clear, nor is it designed in a logical and structured way. However, it does appear to have served as the basis for the evaluation. There is no indication of alterations made, or limitations identified and caveated.	
Executive Feedback on Overall Rating Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>			The report does not give confidence to act. The report is methodologically weak, evidence is incomplete and shallow, and analysis, findings and conclusions do not hold together. The report is poorly structured and the six sections do not hold together in a logically consistent way.